

THE CASE AGAINST LAMSON.

HIS BROTHER-IN-LAW SAID TO HAVE BEEN POISONED WITH ACONITE.

Pecuniary Strain of the American Doctor—The Fatal Visit Made as Soon as he was Prepared for Flight—A Purchase of Poison.

From the London *Daily News*.

The examination of Dr. George Henry Lamson, son of the American chaplain at Florence, charged with having poisoned his brother-in-law, Percy Malcolm St. John, at Blenheim House, School, Wimborne, on the 31st inst., was begun on Saturday inst. Mr. St. John Wohner conducted the prosecution.

The prisoner was dressed in deep mourning, and looked pale and anxious. He is of tall, white complexion, with black hair and a black mustache, and beard rather close to the face.

Mr. Wohner stated that the prisoner was the brother-in-law of the deceased, who was entitled to the sum of \$3,500, which on his death would revert to his sister, the wife of the prisoner. He would show that at the time of the occurrence the prisoner was in want of money, and that shortly before he had pledged his watch and his surgical instruments. On the Thursday prior to the Saturday on which the alleged poisonings took place, the prisoner left the Nelson Hotel, at which he had been staying. He had no money to pay his bill, and had to leave a rug and two performances. On the same day the prisoner met a friend named Tulloch, whom he engaged to shoot a letter to Paris in his name. The only way to gain his father in France. On Friday the prisoner told Tulloch that he had changed his mind, and would go to Wimborne instead. He did not know where he went to Wimborne together. While there the prisoner left Tulloch at a public house, and returned in about twenty minutes, school, and that the boy's health was so bad that he could not live much longer. This statement was wholly untrue, as the boy did not see his mother again until the next day. The prisoner and Tulloch returned together, and that evening Tulloch introduced the prisoner to the landlady of Tyrone Arms Hotel, at which he had been staying. No account was given of the prisoner's return. The prisoner was then provided with means to get back to his country.

He was staying at Sausage Inn, his brother-in-law the medicine which was followed by death, and the same day went to Paris. By the morning of Nov. 21st the prisoner went to the shop of the Messrs. Hanbury, chemists, giving his correct name, and purchased two grained boxes of white sugar, each containing in the form of a dry powder, such as could be readily introduced in the caustic which the prisoner had used in the case of Mrs. St. John. In evidence of the powder, the prisoner had on his mantelpiece while there a blue ribbon which he had received from his wife.

Dr. Bond, F. R. C. S., lecturer on forensic medicine at Westminster Hospital, was called and said: "I went to Wimborne on the 11th of November, and found the body of the victim of the body of the deceased. There were no marks of injury or violence. There was standing paralysis of the lower extremities, and also a slight cyanosis, also evanescence of the signs of old standing. Apart from that, the body appeared to be that of a perfectly healthy young man. There were no injuries, either to the walls of the chest, the result of old inflammation. I found no trace of disease of any of the organs except the heart, which was enlarged. I described the brain as slightly congested, while there was a general congestion of both lungs, the mucous membrane of the stomach, the kidneys, liver, and heart. The spinal cord was very much congested."

Mr. Wohner said: "Did you find anything in the evidence which would account for death from natural causes?"

"I did not, in the period during which the illness had lasted."

Dr. Bond said: "From Drs. Darre and Little an account of what they had noted during their attendance?"

"From the accounts so received, and what you yourself noticed, are you able to form an opinion as to the cause of death?"

"Yes, I am. The poison was derived from a vegetable poison—that is, a vegetable which acts directly on the nervous system, the spinal cord being one of the nerves most liable to damage. It is the cause of the numerous symptoms of the stomach. The appearances did not coincide with the appearance I should expect to find in a natural poison."

"Are there any such persons?"

"Yes, several."

"Among them would mosquito be one?"

"I could such a poison as you have described be administered in such quantity as to cause death in a male?"

"Certainly."

"In the case of mosquito, would you have expected to find the appearance you found in this body?"

"Were the symptoms preceding death different from those two doctors such as you would expect?"

The magistrate here read Dr. Barr's evidence which showed that the deceased had been born in 1846, and that he had been a man of good character, and that he had acted violently. Quinine would not produce such symptoms.

"What had he with him, and that evidence, and that qualified to produce such symptoms as he has described?"

"Would such symptoms be produced by poisons?"

"I have never seen a death from mosquito, but the symptoms are the same as those described by observers of death from mosquito."

"With regard to your general knowledge I should say that the symptoms were such as I should have expected to find from mosquito poison."

The prisoner was then remanded until the 22d inst.

A Protestant Marriage.

Montreal, Dec. 27.—A curious lawsuit has occurred in Canada, which has been pending for ten years. Mr. and Mrs. Larancee decided that they would marry. He was a Protestant; her friends were Catholics, and claimed that she was a Catholic, although she said she was a Protestant. The young folks were married in legal and religious form by a French Canadian Protestant minister. Thereupon the friends of the bridegroom sued for damages, claiming that the marriage was invalid, and that the couple should be separated. The marriage was dissolved, and the couple remained together.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again, this time in a civil ceremony, and the friends of the bridegroom sued again for damages.

They then got married again,